UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ADT SECURITY SERVICES, INC.,

Plaintiff,

VS.

SECURITY ONE INTERNATIONAL, INC. et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No.: 11-CV-05149 YGR

ORDER DENYING WITHOUT PREJUDICE MOTION OF ADT SECURITY SERVICES, INC. FOR ENTRY OF DEFAULT JUDGMENT

Plaintiff ADT Security Services, Inc. ("ADT") has filed a Motion for Default Judgment against Defendants Scellusaleads and Pure Clar, requesting fees, costs, damages, and a permanent injunction.

Having carefully considered the papers submitted and the pleadings in this action, for the reasons set forth below, the Court hereby **DENIES WITHOUT PREJUDICE** the Motion for Default Judgment.

Subsequent to filing its Motion for Default Judgment, ADT filed a Third Amended Complaint. Thus, the pleading on which ADT seeks default judgment is no longer the operative pleading; nor is there any proof that the allegedly defaulting defendants have been served with the operative pleading. What is more, the pleadings in this matter are not set. (*See* Defendant Safe Home Security, Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss, Dkt. No. 158.) Further, damages are not for a sum certain (or a sum that can be made certain by computation), and the evidence necessary to prove damages against the defaulting defendants is nearly identical to the evidence ADT would need to establish liability against the non-defaulting defendants. Thus, entering a default judgment would

## Case 4:11-cv-05149-YGR Document 186 Filed 01/09/13 Page 2 of 2

risk inconsistent judgments between the defaulting and the non-defaulting parties and would result
in duplicative proceedings, which is contrary to the interests of judicial economy.

Based on the foregoing, ADT's Motion for Default Judgment is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

This Order Terminates Dkt. No. 121.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

**Date:** January 9, 2013

YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE